



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/667,775	09/22/2000	Hidenori Kawanishi	717-445P	8167

2292 7590 06/27/2003

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

MONDT, JOHANNES P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2826

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/667,775

Applicant(s)

KAWANISHI ET AL.

Examiner

Johannes P Mondt

Art Unit

2826

--Th MAILING DATE of this communication app ars on the cover sheet with th correspond nce address --

THE REPLY FILED 17 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: _____

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
10. ☐ Other: _____

NATHAN J. FLYNN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: (a) Said semiconductor laser chip 7 (see Figure 5) is covered with the molded resin 1a in Nishino et al (cf. Figure 5). In this regard please note the commonly accepted meaning of the verbiage "cover" in the topographical sense, i.e., meaning 2, as "placed above or about another thing" (Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, tenth Edition); (b) Because Nishino et al is concerned with detectability of targets at some distance by the laser radar system preferably as early, i.e., as distant as possible, a strong, reasonably focused beam over a large distance is an obvious objective of the field of application of Nishino et al. Some minimum amount of diffusion of the laser light as taught by Hirano should thus be considered an obvious safety requirement for the use of said laser radar system. Parenthetically, with regard to the discussion on page 5 of Applicant's response, typical laser radar systems are also based on a pulsed laser signal. (c) Improvement of the quantum efficiency is a universal advantage in the field of laser technology; therefore the teaching by Claisse et al is motivated and combinable as explained in detail in the rejections of claims 4 and 7. In this regard it is noted that Applicant does not address the specific reason for motivation and combinability advanced in the Final Rejection on pages 5-6. (d) That "no evidence has been provided to include the teachings of Andrews" (page 9) is not true: but Applicant does not address the specific motivation and reason for combinability presented in the Final Rejection on page 10. (e) The specific teaching by Okuda relied upon in the rejection of claims 10-11 involves only the mixing of the resins for a diffusion layer.